

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

AFRL-SR-AR-TR-02-

0441

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 10/12/2002		2. REPORT TYPE Final report		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 09/15/01-09/14/02	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE "INVESTIGATION OF INTEGRATED COATING SYSTEM FOR CORROSION PROTECTION"				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER F49620-01-C-0051	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER NA	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 65502F NA	
				5d. PROJECT NUMBER STTR NA	
6. AUTHOR(S) Parkhill, Robert M., Ph.D. Kotov, Nicholas A., Ph.D. Knobbe, Edward T. Ph.D.				5e. TASK NUMBER TX NA	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER NA	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Sciperio, Inc. Oklahoma State University 5202 N Richmond Hill Rd Grants & Contracts Stillwater, Ok. 74075 402 Whitehurst Hall Stillwater, Ok. 74078-1031				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AF1-Final	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AFOSR/NL Attn: Lt. Col. Paul Trulove 801 North Randolph Street, Room 732 Arlington, VA 22203-1977				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) NA	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) NA	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES NA					
14. ABSTRACT This report details the coating systems developed under STTR contract for topic AF01-018. Coating systems comprising an inhibitor-doped layer-by-layer (LBL) assembly basecoat and a dense organically modified silicate (Ormocsil) topcoat were investigated as corrosion-resistant coatings for 2024-T3 aluminum alloy. Neither the LBL nor the Ormocsil materials were found to provide adequate corrosion protection for the underlying metal. A combination of the two coating methods was found to produce a synergistic enhancement in corrosion-resistance characteristics. Incorporation of an active corrosion inhibitor into the LBL coating was also found to improve corrosion-resistance properties. Zincate solutions were found to remove LBL/Ormocsil coatings "on demand" from the aluminum-alloy substrate. All objectives set forth in the original Phase I project have been accomplished successfully, resulting in the development of an environmentally compliant protective coating that incorporates active corrosion inhibitors and that can be removed readily when needed.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Corrosion Inhibitor; Release on Command; Barrier Coating; Sol-Gel; ORMOSIL; Nanocomposite; Layer-by Layer Assembly;					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SEE #12	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 41	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Dr. Robert Parkhill
a. REPORT UNC	b. ABSTRACT UNC	c. THIS PAGE UNC			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 405/624-5751

20030115 104

# INVESTIGATION OF INTEGRATED COATING SYSTEM FOR CORROSION PROTECTION

Sponsored by Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Contract No. F49620-01-C-0052

Item 0001AD  
Final Technical Report

Principal Investigator: Dr. Robert L. Parkhill, Sciperio Inc.  
Co-Principal Investigator: Dr. Nicholas A. Kotov, Oklahoma State University  
Co-Principal Investigator: Dr. Edward T. Knobbe, Oklahoma State University and Sciperio Inc.  
Report Prepared by Dr. Olga M. Kachurina, Sciperio Inc., and Dr. Tammy L. Metroke, Oklahoma State University

## Abstract

Coating systems comprising an inhibitor-doped layer-by-layer (LBL) assembly basecoat and a dense organically modified silicate (Ormosil) topcoat were investigated as corrosion-resistant coatings for 2024-T3 aluminum alloy. As single-layer coatings, neither the LBL nor the Ormosil materials were found to provide adequate corrosion protection for the underlying metal. As determined using electrochemical techniques, a *combination* of the two coating methods was found to produce a synergistic enhancement in corrosion-resistance characteristics. Incorporation of an active corrosion inhibitor into the LBL coating was found to improve significantly its corrosion-resistance properties. The application of a dense Ormosil coating onto the inhibitor-exchanged LBL coating sealed the inhibitor ions into the LBL coating, thereby producing a reservoir of corrosion inhibitors in the direct vicinity of the metal substrate. The overlapping, anisotropic nature of clay platelets in the LBL coating slowed the migration of corrosion initiators that may have breached the integrity of the Ormosil layer, while enabling the lateral diffusion of the inhibitor to the defect site. Two methods were investigated by which to remove the LBL/Ormosil coating systems from the aluminum-alloy substrate. Zincate solutions were found to remove effectively and rapidly LBL/Ormosil coating systems from the metal

substrate, leaving a thin zincate product layer. Dilute oxalate solutions were found to remove LBL assemblies and to provide corrosion protection for the underlying metal.

### **Publications Stemming from this Research Effort**

1. "Ecologically Benign Corrosion Protection with Nanostructured Thin Films," Olga Kachurina, Tammy L. Metroke, John W. Ostrander, Nicholas A. Kotov, and Edward T. Knobbe, to be submitted to *Chemistry of Materials*.
2. "Investigation of Integrated Coating System for Corrosion Protection," R. L. Parkhill, O. Kachurina, T. L. Metroke, J. Ostrander, and N. Kotov. Presented at the Triservice Conference, January 2002.
3. "Corrosion Protection of Aluminum Sheets by Composite Layer-by-Layer Assembly," J. Ostrander, O. Kachurina, T. L. Metroke, E. T. Knobbe, and N. A. Kotov. Presented as a poster at the 223<sup>rd</sup> National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Orlando, Florida, 2002.

### **Table of Abbreviations and Symbols**

<i>A</i>	Area, Electrode Surface (cm <sup>2</sup> )	NMR	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance
AA	Aluminum Alloy	Ormosil	Organically Modified Silicate
ACI	Active Corrosion Inhibitor	PAA	Poly(acrylic acid)
<i>c</i>	Concentration (vol %)	PDDA	Poly(diallyldimethyldiammonium chloride)
<i>C<sub>c</sub></i>	Capacitance, Coating (F/cm <sup>2</sup> )	PDS	Potentiodynamic Scan
<i>C<sub>dl</sub></i>	Capacitance, Double-Layer (F/cm <sup>2</sup> )	PE	Polyelectrolyte
CP	Cross-Polarized, -Polarization (NMR)	<i>R<sub>corr</sub></i>	Resistance, Corrosion (Ω·cm <sup>2</sup> )
<i>d</i>	Thickness, Coating (cm)	<i>R<sub>po</sub></i>	Resistance, Pore (Ω·cm <sup>2</sup> )
<i>E<sub>corr</sub></i>	Potential, Corrosion (V)	<i>R<sub>pol</sub></i>	Resistance, Polarization (Ω·cm <sup>2</sup> )
<i>E<sub>oc</sub></i>	Potential, Open Circuit (V)	<i>R<sub>tot</sub></i>	Resistance, Total (Ω·cm <sup>2</sup> )
<i>E<sub>pit</sub></i>	Potential, Pitting (V)	<i>R<sub>u</sub></i>	Resistance, Solution (Ω·cm <sup>2</sup> )
EIS	Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy	SEM	Scanning Electron Micrograph
<i>f</i>	Frequency (Hz)	<i>t<sub>cr</sub></i>	Time, Coating Removal (s)
<i>J<sub>a</sub></i>	Current Density, Anodic (A/cm <sup>2</sup> )	<i>t<sub>i</sub></i>	Time, Immersion (s)
<i>J<sub>corr</sub></i>	Current Density, Corrosion (A/cm <sup>2</sup> )	<i>T<sub>r</sub></i>	Temperature, Room or Ambient (°C)
LBL	Layer-by-Layer	TEOS	Tetraethoxysilane or Tetraethyl Orthosilicate
<i>M</i>	Molar (mol/L)	VTMOS	Vinyltrimethoxysilane
MAS	Magic-Angle Spinning (NMR)	<i>Z</i>	Impedance (Ω·cm <sup>2</sup> )
MEMO	3-(Trimethoxysilyl)propylmethacrylate	<i>ε<sub>0</sub></i>	Dielectric Constant, Absolute (F/m)
MW	Molecular Weight (Da)	<i>ε<sub>r</sub></i>	Dielectric Constant, Relative (–)
<i>n</i>	Number (–)	<i>φ</i>	Angle, Phase (deg)

## **I. LBL/Ormosil Coating Systems**

### **A. Introduction**

The U.S. Air Force is presently facing a critical need to develop environmentally compliant surface treatments designed to mitigate corrosion of aircraft aluminum alloys (AA's). Currently available surface pretreatments for AA's have been determined to comprise human and environmental health hazards (*e.g.*, hexavalent-chromium-based conversion coatings) and/or to exhibit limited effectiveness as corrosion inhibitors. The goal of the proposed project is to prepare and evaluate advanced hybrid coatings that:

- Are environmentally compliant;
- Serve as an effective barrier layer that is readily incorporated into a multilayer paint system;
- Contain a reservoir of nanoengineered structures targeted to provide electrochemically active corrosion inhibitors "on demand" in the case of a barrier-layer breach; and
- Release (*i.e.*, separate from the substrate) "on command."

In recent years, a wide variety of novel coating processes have been developed as potential replacements for hexavalent-chromium-based conversion coatings as described in various reviews [1–3]. These processes have relied on inorganic molecules that react with the oxidized aluminum surface to form mixed oxides, metal ions that are able to oxidize the metal surface during service life, organic polymers with a high complexing capacity for aluminum surfaces, and inorganic-film-forming oxides [4]. Recent developments have included rare-earth-based conversion coatings [5], Co-rich oxide layers [6], Mn-based conversion coatings [7], Mo-based conversion coatings [8], Zr-based conversion coatings [9], silane-based surface treatments [10–11], and  $\text{Cr}^{3+}$ -based conversion coatings [12].

Coatings derived from organically modified silicate (Ormosil) materials [13] have found use in a diverse range of high-performance applications, including enhancement of mechanical,

thermal, optical, corrosion-resistance, and electrical properties of the underlying materials [14]. Organically modified silicate (Ormosil) coatings have been found to provide good corrosion resistance for metal substrates based on their ability to form dense barriers to the penetration of corrosion initiators [11, 15]. Review articles by Guglielmi [16], Knobbe *et al.* [17], and Twite and Bierwagen [3] indicate that sol-gel-derived coatings are of interest for improving corrosion resistance of various metallic substrates.

In general, the corrosion-resistance behaviors of sol-gel-derived coatings are based on the ability of the coatings to provide excellent barriers to the penetration of corrosion initiators. In order to enhance the coating corrosion-resistance characteristics, it is necessary to introduce an *active corrosion inhibitor* (ACI) into the coating system to provide a secondary mechanism of corrosion protection in addition to the protective-barrier properties of the Ormosil. However, the high density of the Ormosil coating, which provides its good barrier properties, may inhibit the migration of ACI's through the coating, thereby limiting their effectiveness. Therefore, it is desirable to introduce a reservoir of ACI's into the system—preferably in the immediate vicinity of the metal surface—which are immobilized on a suitable substrate layer in the absence of reactions leading to general or localized corrosion.

Layer-by-layer (LBL) film assembly has been used to prepare coatings derived from a variety of oppositely charged polyelectrolytes (PE's) [18] with other species such as proteins [19], conducting polymers [20], zirconium phosphate [21], dyes [22], metal nanoparticles [23], semiconductor quantum dots [24], aluminosilicates [25], and graphite oxide [26] onto various substrate materials. LBL assembly involves the adsorption of polycations and polyanions from solutions of charged species onto an oppositely charged substrate. Subsequent repetitive application, rinsing, and drying of the growing film onto alternatively charged PE's allows the

buildup of a LBL-assembled multilayer coating system. The LBL assembly process is governed by adsorption and desorption equilibria of species with appropriate hydrophobicities, charges, and charge densities.

Previous work has shown that the introduction of various clays into LBL assemblies provide coatings with useful properties. For example, Kleinfeld and Ferguson prepared LBL assemblies of poly(diallyldimethyldiammonium chloride) (PDDA) and exfoliated sheets of synthetic hectorite, a mica-type layered silicate on Si wafers [27]. Kotov *et al.* investigated the morphology and gas permeation of montmorillonite-PE self-assembled multilayer systems on poly(ethyleneterephthalate) as highly selective ultrathin membranes [28]. At this time, the corrosion-resistance characteristics of LBL-derived coatings have not been fully investigated. However, advantages of LBL coatings for corrosion resistance include the simplicity of the deposition procedure, control of the average thickness of the PE layers, the ability to produce dense layers, and the ability to exchange corrosion-inhibiting ions.

In this study, the preparation and corrosion-resistance characteristics of multilayer LBL/Ormosil coatings on 2024-T3 aluminum alloy were investigated. Experimental results indicate that the investigated LBL/Ormosil system had the potential to enhance significantly the corrosion-resistance characteristics of the underlying metal substrate. In this study, a multilayer system was prepared in which an absorbent, ion-exchangeable LBL-assembled underlayer is exchanged with an ACI. The ACI-doped layer is then sealed with a protective Ormosil coating. This coating system provides two mechanisms of corrosion protection. First, the dense Ormosil layer provides primary barrier protection. In the event that the integrity of the Ormosil layer is breached, the ion-exchanged LBL coating provides a reservoir of ACI's. At the onset of corrosion, the ACI molecules may migrate through the underlayer to the corrosion site, thereby

providing active corrosion protection in a dense coating system. Importantly, nanocomposite LBL coatings also provide a barrier function to the perpendicular movement of ACI's; however, they provide for the lateral diffusion responsible for rapid delivery of ACI's to defect sites.

## **B. Experimental**

### **1. Materials**

Tetraethoxysilane or tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS), 3-(trimethoxysilyl)propylmethacrylate (MEMO), and vinyltrimethoxysilane (VTMOS) were purchased from Aldrich or Gelest and were used as received. Swy-2 sodium montmorillonite (University of Missouri-Columbia, Source Clay Minerals Repository) was used as received without further purification. Poly(acrylic acid) (PAA), molecular weight (MW)  $\approx$  450 kDa, and poly(diallyldimethyldiammonium chloride) (PDDA), MW  $\approx$  400–500 kDa, were purchased from Aldrich and used as received.

### **2. Aluminum Surface Preparation**

Substrate materials were 2024-T3 aluminum alloys (AA's). Test pieces were first wiped with hexanes and subsequently with methanol to reduce the concentration of residue from the manufacturing process, as well as any debris. Samples were placed in covered glass containers containing acetone and ultrasonicated (Fisher Scientific FS20) for approximately 45 minutes, then removed from the solution and allowed to dry at ambient conditions.

### **3. Preparation of Coating Solutions**

A "clay solution" was prepared by dispersing approximately 1.5 g of clay in about 200 mL of deionized water followed by ultrasonication for 45 min. The solution was added to 800 mL of deionized water and shaken vigorously to promote dissolution of the clay material. The "PDPA coating solution" was a 1% aqueous solution of PDPA. The "PAA coating solution" was a 1% aqueous solution of PAA.



#### **4. Layer-by-Layer Assembly Preparation**

In order to prepare LBL assemblies, the AA substrates were sequentially immersed in a PDDA solution for 5 min. to allow for good adsorption of the PE. The samples were removed from the PDDA solution and briefly rinsed with clean water from a plastic squeeze bottle to remove excess PE from the surface and edges. Subsequently, the samples were then transferred to another beaker containing clean water where they were rinsed for an additional 5 min. The samples were then transferred to a beaker containing a PAA solution, where the PE was allowed to adsorb for 5 min. The rinsing process was repeated, and the samples were immersed one more time for 5 min. in PDDA and then rinsed again. The wet samples were immersed in the clay suspension for 5 min.

This process was repeated for up to  $n = 20$  layers, with visually apparent buildup of PE and clay after only  $n = 4$  layers. The production of coatings composed of  $n \geq 7$  layers may not be accomplished in one single experiment. Between layers, after the clay step and rinse, as required, the samples were dried with compressed air to remove as much water as possible and placed on end in a clean, dry, closed container. The experiment was then resumed in the following session. This interruption was not found to affect the sample quality.

#### **5. Sol-Gel Coating Preparation**

Ormosils were prepared by mixing 5.6 mL of TEOS, 7.6 mL of VTMOs, 2.0 mL of MEMO, and 9.8 mL of 0.05-molar ( $M$ )  $\text{HNO}_3$ . The reaction mixtures were stirred for one hour prior to film deposition. The resultant Ormosil solutions were deposited onto cleaned or LBL-coated AA's by a spray-coating technique using an airbrush setup. The coatings were allowed to dry at ambient conditions for at least 24 hours prior to their characterization.



## **6. Corrosion Inhibitors**

In order to prepare inhibitor-doped layers, LBL-coated test coupons were immersed in 0.25-M  $K_2Cr_2O_7$  for 30 min. at room or ambient temperature ( $T_r$ ) or into a conversion-coating solution developed by Schrieffer [29] in order to introduce  $Cr^{6+}$  or  $Co^{3+}$  inhibitor ions, respectively. The Schrieffer conversion-coating solution was prepared by mixing 55 g/L of  $NH_4NO_3$ , 26 g/L of  $Co(NO_3)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ , and 26.4 g/L of  $HCOOH$  in 750 mL of  $H_2O$ . The pH of this solution was adjusted to 7.0–7.1 with concentrated  $NH_4OH$ . Subsequently, 3.5 mL/L  $H_2O_2$  (30 wt. %) and distilled  $H_2O$  were added to increase the volume to 1 L. The stock solution was heated to 140 °F (60 °C) for 30–90 min. The final pH was adjusted to 6.8–7.0 using concentrated  $NH_4OH$ . Prior to use, the stock solution was allowed to cool to  $T_r$ . After immersion in the inhibitor solutions, the test coupons were rinsed with deionized water.

## **7. Potentiodynamic Scan and Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy**

Potentiodynamic scan (PDS) and electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) were used to evaluate the protective properties of investigated coatings. Detailed descriptions of these electrochemical methods can be found elsewhere [30]. Each coating system was evaluated in triplicate. Electrochemical measurements were performed using a Gamry PC3/300 potentiostat with Gamry Corrosion Measurement System DC105 and EIS300 software. A three-electrode cell equipped with a Pt counter-electrode, a  $Ag/AgCl/Cl^-$  (3-M KCl) reference electrode, and a coated or noncoated 2024-T3 AA panel with an exposed area of 0.36 cm<sup>2</sup> as the working electrode was used. All measurements were conducted in dilute Harrison's solution (0.35 wt %  $(NH_4)_2SO_4$  and 0.05 wt % NaCl) at  $25 \pm 1$  °C. This mixture of electrolytes is considered to emulate closely the atmospheric environment for aircraft [31]. Coatings were immersed in dilute Harrison's solution 15 min. prior to the test. The reported values of potentials shown in the polarization curves and listed in the tables are given relative to the  $Ag/AgCl/Cl^-$  reference

electrode. PDS's were acquired in the region from  $-50$  mV vs.  $E_{oc}$  (open circuit potential) to the pitting potential,  $E_{pit}$ , as determined using the criterion described by Kelly *et al.* [32], wherein pitting occurs by the time the anodic current density of the specimen reached  $J_a = 3 \times 10^{-5}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>.

EIS tests were performed in triplicate on a Gamry PC3/300 potentiostat using a Gamry Corrosion Measurement System CMS100 and CMS300 software. Coatings were immersed in dilute Harrison's solution for 30 min. before data acquisition. The electrode arrangement is identical to the above-described PDS cell setup. EIS spectra were acquired in the frequency ( $f$ ) range of 10 mHz to 10 kHz ( $10^{-2}$ – $10^{+4}$  Hz) with 10 mV-applied alternating current (vs.  $E_{oc}$ ). Standard coating-analysis criteria are as follows: Impedance values of  $|Z| > 10^9 \Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$  are indicative of coatings with excellent barrier properties. Coatings with  $10^6 \leq |Z| \leq 10^9 \Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$  are considered to be good coatings. Coatings with  $|Z| < 10^6 \Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$  are considered to be poor coatings [33].

The polarization resistance method, using Gamry software, was used to define corrosion potential,  $E_{corr}$ ; corrosion resistance,  $R_{corr}$ , which is defined as the slope of the current density–potential curve at the corrosion potential; and corrosion current density,  $J_{corr}$ , which is defined as  $20 \text{ mV}/R_{corr}$ , as per *ASTM G3-89*. PDS, using Gamry software, was used to define  $E_{corr}$  and  $E_{pit}$ .

## **8. Solid-State Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy**


Solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) experiments were performed on a Chemagnetics CMX-II 300-MHz (7.06-T) spectrometer using a Chemagnetics 300VXP-208 double-resonance (H–X) probe for data collection. Resonance frequencies for <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H were 75.6 and 301.0 MHz, respectively. All peaks were referenced to an external tetramethylsilane standard. Magic-angle spinning (MAS) was carried out in 5-mm zirconia rotors, spinning at 6

kHz. NMR spectra were collected with a quasi-adiabatic cross-polarization (CP) pulse sequence [34] using a 1-s pulse delay, a 2-ms contact time, a 4- $\mu$ s pulse width, and 10,000 scans.

### C. Results and Discussion






#### 1. Characteristics of Single-Layer LBL and Ormosil Coatings

The multilayer LBL-assembled/Ormosil coatings investigated during this study were composed of an inhibitor-doped LBL basecoat and an Ormosil topcoat. Figure 1 shows a schematic of this coating system. Figure 2 shows the structures of the polyelectrolytes and silanes used in this study.



**Figure 1: Representation of a Multilayer Coating System Comprising an Inhibitor-Doped LBL-Assembled Basecoat and a Sol-Gel-Derived Ormosil Topcoat**


The LBL coating was prepared by the repetitive, sequential immersion of the substrate material in solutions of positively charged PDDA polycation, negatively charged PAA polyanion, and montmorillonite clay platelets in a fashion similar to that previously described by Kotov *et al.* [28]. Electrostatic attraction between the charged species produces thin, nanometer-scale monolayers on the substrate material.

<div style="text-align: center;">  <p>PDDA</p>  <p>PAA</p> </div>	<div style="text-align: center;">  <p>VTMO</p>  <p>MEMO</p>  <p>TEOS</p> </div>
<p><b>(a) Polyelectrolytes</b></p>	<p><b>(b) Silanes</b></p>
<p><b>Figure 2: Structures of Chemicals Used in this Study</b></p>	

LBL-assembled coatings containing different functionalities made from weak PE's can be used as reservoirs for ACI ions. Dilute aqueous dispersions of montmorillonite clay particles are known to exfoliate into single sheets (or thin platelets) in which the negative charge is balanced by inter- and intralamellar  $\text{Na}^+$  cations. These montmorillonite sheets and platelets are expected to preferentially self-assemble parallel to the substrate [35] and to cover large surface areas, thereby smoothing defects introduced during the LBL film-formation process [36]. The negatively charged PAA may provide ion-exchange capacity for positively charged ions, such as  $\text{Co}^{3+}$  and  $\text{Cr}^{3+}$ . The positively charged PDDA may provide ion-exchange capacity for negatively charged ions, such as  $\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7^{2-}$ . These characteristics are of interest to corrosion resistance studies due to (a) their ability to produce a dense, pore/defect-free layer; and (b) their capability of

allowing ion exchange with ACI ions. The presence of these exchange sites affords tremendous versatility and the possibility of fine-tuning the properties of LBL coatings for inhibitor absorption and corrosion protection.

The Ormosil coating investigated is a mixture of TEOS, VTMOs, and MEMO. Their  $^1\text{H}$ - $^{13}\text{C}$  CP/MAS NMR spectra, shown in Figure 3, indicate that the network structure of this Ormosil contains pendant vinyl and methacrylate groups that are expected to occupy pore space and surface positions. Distinct chemical shift peaks are observed in the  $^1\text{H}$ - $^{13}\text{C}$  CP/MAS NMR spectrum due to vinyl (138.3 and 130.1 ppm) and methacrylate (169.2, 137.7, 126.8, 67.1, 22.0, 18.2, and 8.5 ppm) functionalities [37]. Additional peaks are observed in the 0–35-ppm region, indicating small contributions from possible acid-catalyzed homopolymerization of vinyl groups. The presence of pendant groups is anticipated to make the Ormosil coating more hydrophobic, slowing the penetration of water and corrosion initiators.



**Figure 3:  $^1\text{H}$ - $^{13}\text{C}$  CP/MAS NMR Spectra of a TEOS-VTMOs-MEMO Ormosil**

## **2. Characteristics of Inhibitors Investigated**

$\text{Cr}^{6+}$  and  $\text{Co}^{3+}$  ions were selected as inhibitors for this study based on their reported corrosion-resistance characteristics. Hexavalent chromium was chosen as a control because it is used as the active ingredient in standard military and industrial corrosion-resistance pretreatment for aluminum alloys. While the composition, structure, and mechanism of corrosion protection provided by chromate ions is not definitively known, extensive research in this area has provided insights into the unique aspects of these coating systems [38]. The cobalt conversion coating developed by Schrieffer was chosen based on the reported excellent corrosion-resistance characteristics, lower toxicity of cobalt(III) compared to chromium(VI), and reported good paint adhesion properties [1]. The cobalt conversion coating is prepared from an aqueous solution of a cobalt(II) salt, an ammonium salt, an inorganic complexing agent, an organic complexing agent, and an oxidizing agent, leading to the formation of highly stable cobalt(III) complexes that are stored in the oxide conversion coating. The complexes are believed to be of the general formula  $\text{Na}_3[\text{Co}(\text{NO}_2)_2(\text{X})_4]$  ( $\text{X} = ^-\text{OOCH}$ ,  $^-\text{OOCCH}_3$ , etc.) based on the reagents listed in the experimental portion of the patent. The soluble inhibitor complexes formed may migrate throughout the coating system and/or over the surface providing a self-healing repair process considered similar to that exhibited by the chromate conversion coating [1].

## **3. Coating Characterization Methods**

Corrosion-resistance characteristics of single- and multilayer LBL/Ormosil coatings were analyzed using electrochemical techniques: polarization resistance method, potentiodynamic polarization scan, PDS, and EIS. Electrochemical analysis methods provide a quantitative description of coating characteristics.

The models used for coating analysis via EIS were the equivalent-electrical-circuit model for a simple-corroding-electrode model (*ASTM G3*) and the model for a typical coated metal, as

selected from the Gamry software. Figure 4 shows the equivalent circuits used to model the experimental data. Model (a) is a simple-corroding-electrode model (*ASTM G3*) used for analysis of bare AA's and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}/\text{Cr}^{3+}$ -treated metals, where  $R_u$  is the solution resistance;  $R_{\text{pol}}$  is the polarization resistance;  $R_{\text{po}}$  is the pore resistance;  $R_{\text{tot}}$  is the total resistance, the sum of the resistive components of the equivalent circuit,  $R_{\text{po}} + R_{\text{pol}}$ ; and  $C_{\text{dl}}$  is the double-layer capacitance. Model (b) is typical of the coated metals used for LBL and Ormosil coatings, where  $C_c$  denotes the coating capacitance.





Figure 5 represents a typical Bode plot for a LBL film assembly (15 layers) on 2024-T3 AA, in which Curve 1 is a plot of  $|Z(f)|$ ; Curve 2 is a plot of phase angle,  $\phi(f)$ ; and the solid line is a curve fit for a typical-coated-metal model. The undamaged coating generally exhibited very



high  $|Z|$  values at low  $f$ . The approach of  $\phi \rightarrow -90^\circ$  at low  $f$  is also indicative of a good, homogeneous coating.



**Figure 5: EIS Data Recorded for 15 Layers of LBL Coating**

#### **4. Corrosion-Resistance Characteristics of Inhibitors**

Corrosion-resistance characteristics of  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ - and  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ -based surface treatments were investigated using EIS and PDS. Table I and Table II present the numerical results while Figure 6 (p. 15) plots the PDS results for all coating systems investigated.

- Plot I displays values for (a) bare 2024-T3 AA, (b) AA treated with  $\text{K}_2\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7$ , and (c) AA treated with a  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ -based conversion coating.
- Plot II displays values for (a) an LBL/Ormosil coating, (b) an Ormosil coating, and (c) an LBL coating ( $n = 15$ ).
- Plot III displays values for (a) a Co-exchanged LBL coating and (b) a Cr-exchanged LBL coating.
- Plot IV displays values for (a) a Co-exchanged LBL/Ormosil coating system and (b) a Cr-exchanged LBL/Ormosil coating system.

**Table I: Electrochemical Characteristics Derived from EIS for Coating Systems Under Investigation**


Composition	$C_e, \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$	$R_{pol}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{po}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{tot}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$\phi, \text{deg}$
2024-T3 AA	—	48	—	48	—
0.25 M $\text{K}_2\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7$	3	1580	10	1590	-64
Schrieffer	3	316	18	334	-47
LBL ( $n = 15$ )	2	1015	17	1032	-22
Ormosil	0.1	121	5	127	-12
LBL/Ormosil	0.2	1352	2	1355	-81
LBL+ $\text{Co}^{3+}$	3	1922	8	1930	-63
LBL+ $\text{Cr}^{6+}$	3	2520	15	2535	-80
LBL+ $\text{Co}^{3+}$ /Ormosil	$8 \times 10^{-3}$	2038	137	2169	-62
LBL+ $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ /Ormosil	$7 \times 10^{-3}$	2624	151	2775	-65

**Table II: Electrochemical Characteristics Derived from PDS for Coating Systems Under Investigation**

Composition	$J_{corr} \times 10^7, \text{A}/\text{cm}^2$	$E_{corr}, \text{V}$	$E_{pit}, \text{V}$	$R_{corr}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$
2024-T3 AA	5	-0.682	-0.509	49
0.25 M $\text{K}_2\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7$	0.16	-0.390	-0.09	1500
Schrieffer	0.79	-0.348	-0.158	320
LBL ( $n = 15$ )	0.24	-0.477	-0.310	1042
Ormosil	1.95	-0.463	-0.02	128
LBL/Ormosil	0.19	-0.330	+0.11	1300
LBL+ $\text{Co}^{3+}$	0.12	-0.410	-0.09	1985
LBL+ $\text{Cr}^{6+}$	0.1	-0.390	+0.06	2500
LBL+ $\text{Co}^{3+}$ /Ormosil	0.09	-0.49	+1.3	2617
LBL+ $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ /Ormosil	0.12	-0.45	+0.88	2037

PDS data indicate the  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$  ion provides good corrosion-resistance characteristics, as  $R_{corr}$  was found to increase from 49  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for bare AA to 1500  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  upon treatment with  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$  ions. Similarly,  $E_{corr}$  and  $E_{pit}$  values were found to shift to more-positive values from -0.682 V and -0.509 V for bare AA to -0.390 V and -0.09 V, respectively, for AA treated with  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ . EIS data at low  $f$  also show the increase of  $R_{pol}$  from 48  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  to 1580  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  upon treatment with  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$  ions. The  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ -based conversion coating developed by Schrieffer showed a low  $R_{tot}$  value of 334  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ . The values of  $E_{pit}$  and  $E_{corr}$  were shifted to -0.158 and -0.348 V, respectively, indicative of a coating providing some corrosion protection. As with the  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$  treatment, high  $C_e$

values indicate the thin nature of this conversion coating, taking into consideration the inverse relationships between coating capacity and film thickness.




### 5. Optimization of LBL Coating Properties

In order to determine the optimum number of polyelectrolyte layers needed for complete AA-substrate-surface coverage, electrochemical characteristics were investigated as a function of the number of layer deposition cycles, as reported in Table III.

**Table III: Electrochemical Characteristics for LBL Coatings on 2024-T3 Aluminum Alloy as a Function of the Number of LBL Films Deposited**

$n$	$C_g, \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$	$R_{po}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{pol}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{tot}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$
2024-T3 AA	—	—	42	42
3	4.1	8	374	384
5	4.1	6	396	402
7	4.7	12	344	356
9	5.3	11	540	551
11	3.7	11	544	555
13	5.3	14	1361	1375
15	1.9	17	1015	1032
17	1.0	21	1404	1329
20	1.0	17	1010	1027

Figure 7 plots  $R_{tot}(n)$  values. As  $n$  increased from 0 to 5, an increase in  $R_{tot}$  from 42 to 402  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  was observed. An increase in  $n$  from 5 to 11 did not significantly increase the value of  $R_{tot}$ . An increase in  $n$  from 11 to 13 led to a further increase in  $R_{tot}$  from 555 to 1375  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ . When the number of polyelectrolyte layers increased to  $n = 20$ , it did not appear to increase  $R_{tot}$ . For coatings prepared from  $n = 20$ , a dramatic *decrease* in film adhesion was observed, as these coatings were found to readily delaminate from the substrate. For this reason,  $n = 15$  was chosen



**Figure 7: Total Resistance as a Function of the Number of Layers**

as the optimum LBL coating for further investigation, as this coating thickness appears to provide good AA surface coverage and to maintain good adhesion characteristics.

A decrease is observed in  $C_c$  extracted from the typical-coated-metal model from  $5.3 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$  for  $n = 9$  PE layers to  $1.9 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$  for  $n = 15$

(1)	$C_c = \frac{\epsilon_r \epsilon_0 A}{d}$
-----	---

and further to  $1.0 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$  for  $n = 20$ . Considering Equation (1), which defines  $C_c$  in terms of  $\epsilon_r$ , the relative dielectric constant;  $\epsilon_0$ , the absolute dielectric constant of a vacuum ( $8.85 \times 10^{-12}$  F/m);  $A$ , the electrode surface area; and  $d$ , the coating thickness, this behavior is indicative of an increase in  $d$  of the LBL assembly [39]. It is anticipated that the addition of each subsequent LBL-assembled layer would lead to a gradual linear increase in  $d$  and therefore in  $R_{\text{tot}}$ . However, this behavior is *not* observed. Two regions were observed in which  $R_{\text{tot}}$  remained relatively constant with increasing  $n$ . This behavior may be attributed to the AA surface preparation and/or homogeneity. In the event that the AA substrate contains islands that are not charged or are hydrophobic due to insufficient cleaning, inhomogeneous coating deposition would be observed. During the first few layers, a nonlinear increase in coverage is observed as the film is covering properly cleaned areas in preference to defect sites. With repetition of the film-deposition procedure, the surface becomes covered, leading to real film growth and an increase in  $R_{\text{tot}}$ . Until the first complete layer is deposited,  $C_c$  is determined by the AA surface inhomogeneities.

Despite increases in  $R_{\text{tot}}$  with  $n$ , a significant increase in corrosion resistance was *not* observed upon coating the AA with the  $n = 15$  LBL film.  $R_{\text{corr}}$  values were found to be  $1042 \text{ k}\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$  compared to  $1500 \text{ k}\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$  for  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -based coating. Observed  $E_{\text{corr}}$  values were found to be  $-0.682$ ,  $-0.390$ , and  $-0.477$  V for bare AA,  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -treated AA, and a  $n = 15$  LBL-assembled coating, respectively. Similarly,  $E_{\text{pit}}$  values were  $-0.509$ ,  $-0.09$ , and  $-0.310$  V for analogous coatings. This shift into the more-positive potential region for  $E_{\text{corr}}$  and  $E_{\text{pit}}$  indicates the

formation of a thin, protective film on the substrate; while the LBL film assembly may provide minimal corrosion protection, the corrosion-resistance performance of the  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$  is superior to that of the LBL film assembly. The  $\phi$  for  $|Z|$  at low  $f$  is closer to  $-90^\circ$  for  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$  ( $-64^\circ$ ) than for a  $n = 15$  LBL coating ( $-22^\circ$ ), also indicative of the superior coverage and corrosion-protection properties of  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ . Despite the low corrosion-protective properties afforded by the LBL coating,  $R_{po}$  was found to be in the range of 6–21  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for all investigated systems; these results indicate that the LBL coating forms a passivating layer on the surface of the  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  and increases the natural  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  resistance.

#### **6. Corrosion Protection Provided by Incorporation of Montmorillonite Clay Platelets**

Recent work by Dai has shown that alternating PE thin films without clay particles inside the layer structure provides good corrosion protection for aluminum surfaces [40]. To determine the corrosion-protective properties of the montmorillonite clay platelets in the LBL assembly, PDDA/PAA/clay LBL assemblies were compared to analogous PDDA/PAA coatings prepared without clay particles in the layer structure. Table IV shows results of electrochemical analysis for these coating systems. Impedance data indicate that incorporation of clay platelets increases  $R_{pol}$  for  $n = 13, 15$ , and  $17$  coatings by more than twofold. The  $R_{pol}$  values are in the ranges of 447–501 and 1010–1404  $\text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for  $n = 13$ – $17$  coatings without and with the clay platelets, respectively. The  $R_{po}$  is very small for both systems, but the value for PDDA/PAA assemblies is one order of magnitude lower than for PDDA/PAA clay assemblies. The  $C_c$  is more than two times lower for  $n = 13$ – $17$  layered films containing clay platelets than for analogous coatings prepared without clay platelets; this behavior may be indicative of their increased thickness and better protective properties, as surface passivation generally increases with coating thickness.

**Table IV: Electrochemical Characteristics for LBL Coatings With and Without Clay Platelets on 2024-T3 Aluminum Alloy**

<i>n</i>	Composition	$C_e, \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$	$R_{po}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{pol}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{tot}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$
13	PDDA/PAA	4.4	1	501	502
15	PDDA/PAA	5.0	1	447	448
17	PDDA/PAA	5.0	1	502	503
13	PDDA/PAA/Clay	5.3	14	1361	1375
15	PDDA/PAA/Clay	1.9	17	1015	1032
17	PDDA/PAA/Clay	1.0	21	1404	1329

These data indicate that clay platelets provide the LBL films with additional corrosion-protective properties. In the course of LBL deposition they are assembled into well-ordered structures wherein individual sheets are oriented parallel to each other and to the substrate surface. Platelet organization of this type yields a very high barrier function, approximately  $12\times$  higher than in the case of PE combinations with random platelet orientations. LBL organization greatly reduces the permeation of gases and ions through such films [41].

#### **7. Corrosion-Resistance Characteristics of the Ormosil Thin Film**

The Ormosil used in this study provided moderate corrosion-resistance characteristics for the 2024-T3 AA substrate.  $R_{corr}$  was  $128 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ ; similarly,  $R_{po}$  was low,  $5 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ , indicative of porosity present in the coating.  $C_e$  was smaller for the Ormosil coating than for the LBL coating, indicating that the thickness of the Ormosil was greater than that of the LBL coating (assuming that they have similar  $\epsilon_r$  values).  $E_{corr}$  and  $E_{pit}$  were found to shift in the positive direction upon coating the metal substrate with the Ormosil coating. For example,  $E_{corr}$  was found to increase from  $-0.682$  to  $-0.463 \text{ V}$  and  $E_{pit}$  was found to increase from  $-0.509$  to  $-0.02 \text{ V}$ , indicating an enhancement in corrosion protection afforded by coating the AA surface with the Ormosil thin film. The moderate corrosion protection afforded by the Ormosil coating was confirmed by the salt-spray test (results not shown), as localized pitting was observed on the test coupon. Corrosion-resistance properties of the Ormosil coating may be attributed to moderate



barrier properties and to excellent compatibility and adhesion between the metal substrate and the Ormosil coating.

### **8. Corrosion-Resistance Characteristics of Inhibitor-Doped LBL Films**

Introduction of known ACI ions using the exchange capacity of the LBL coating gives an increase of corrosion-resistance characteristics of the LBL films. Inhibitor incorporation was not found to change  $d$  significantly, as  $C_c$  remained in the same range for non-doped and inhibitor-doped LBL film assemblies.  $R_{tot}$  was found to increase from  $1032 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for non-doped LBL to 1930 and  $2535 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -doped LBL films, respectively. Similarly,  $E_{corr}$  values were found to increase slightly from  $-0.477 \text{ V}$  for non-doped LBL to  $-0.410$  and  $-0.390 \text{ V}$ , for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -doped LBL films, respectively;  $E_{pit}$  values were also found to increase from  $-0.310 \text{ V}$  for non-doped LBL to  $-0.09$  and  $+0.06 \text{ V}$ , for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -doped LBL films, respectively. Analogously,  $\phi$  also changed from  $-22^\circ$  to  $-63^\circ$  and  $-80^\circ$  for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -exchanged LBL coatings, respectively.

### **9. Multilayer Coating Systems**

Figure 8 shows a scanning electron micrograph (SEM) of the cross-section of an LBL/Ormosil coating system. Five distinct regions are observed in this image: (1) the AA substrate, (2) the LBL coating, (3) the LBL coating/sol-gel coating interfacial layer, (4) the sol-gel coating, and (5) the imbedding polymer matrix. From this image, the LBL, interface, and sol-gel coating thicknesses are estimated to be approximately  $0.5$ ,  $0.5$ , and  $1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ , respectively.

Although ACI ions are expected to retain some of their mobility in the LBL/Ormosil coating system, the ACI ions are anticipated to be concentrated in the LBL coating. The uppermost portion of the LBL coating may become sealed by the sol-gel film as curing may promote condensation reactions between the sol-gel film and the clay platelets, resulting in a

thin interfacial layer. The LBL coating near the AA surface is expected to remain unchanged and to serve as a medium for ACI diffusion.



**Figure 8: Cross-Section of an LBL/Ormosil Coating System (SEM)**

#### **10. Non-Inhibitor-Doped LBL/Ormosil**

Additional corrosion protection is provided when the LBL coating is used in combination with the sol-gel coating when compared to the LBL or Ormosil coatings alone.  $R_{tot}$  was found to increase from  $1032 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for non-doped LBL to  $1355 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  LBL/Ormosil multilayer films.  $E_{corr}$  values increased from  $-0.477 \text{ V}$  for LBL to  $-0.330 \text{ V}$  for the LBL/Ormosil coating;  $E_{pit}$  values were also found to increase from  $-0.310 \text{ V}$  for non-doped LBL to  $+0.11 \text{ V}$  for


LBL/Ormosil multilayer coatings. The  $\phi$  at low  $f$  for the 15-layer LBL film/Ormosil is  $-81^\circ$ , indicative of a good quality, undamaged coating. These properties also indicate that the Ormosil layer is highly compatible with the underlying LBL coating.

#### **11. Inhibitor-Doped LBL/Ormosil Multilayer Coating Systems**

Combination of an inhibitor-doped LBL coating with an Ormosil coating was found to enhance the corrosion-resistance characteristics of the LBL coatings.  $R_{tot}$  was found to increase from  $1355 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for LBL/Ormosil to 2169 and  $2775 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -doped LBL/Ormosil films, respectively. For these coating systems,  $E_{corr}$  values were found to decrease from  $-0.330 \text{ V}$  for non-doped LBL to  $-0.49$  and  $-0.45 \text{ V}$ , for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -doped LBL/Ormosil films, respectively;  $E_{pit}$  values were found to dramatically increase from  $+0.11 \text{ V}$  for non-doped LBL to  $+1.3$  and  $+0.88 \text{ V}$  for  $\text{Co}^{3+}$ - and  $\text{Cr}^{6+}$ -doped LBL films, respectively.  $R_{po}$  increased from  $\leq 15 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$  for all other LBL/Ormosil combinations to  $137\text{--}151 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ , indicating the combination of the Ormosil barrier properties with those of the inhibitor-doped LBL coating produces a coating system in which it is harder to penetrate the pores.

#### **12. Performance Characteristics of Multilayer LBL/Ormosil Coating Systems**

Ion-exchanged LBL/Ormosil coatings were found to provide good corrosion protection of 2024-T3 AA. Synergistic properties of the component layers are expected to contribute to the corrosion-resistance properties. The coating system is composed of (a) an inhibitor-doped LBL base layer and (b) a dense, sol-gel-derived topcoat, as shown in Figure 9. The inhibitor-doped LBL coating is expected to provide a reservoir for ACI ions. In the absence of reactions leading to corrosion, the ions are immobilized within the LBL coating due to electrostatic attractions between the ion and the charged polyelectrolyte or clay layers. The dense sol-gel-derived topcoat provides a primary mechanism of barrier corrosion protection.



**Figure 9: Representation of the Migration of Active Corrosion Inhibitor Ions through the Multilayer LBL/Ormosil System**

In the event that the integrity of the sol-gel layer is breached, water and other corrosion initiators may permeate into the LBL coating, promoting migration of ions within it. The permeation rates of  $H_2O$ ,  $O_2$ , and ACI's are expected to decrease as a function of (a) LBL coating thickness, density, and defect content; (b) Ormosil coating thickness, density, and pore size; (c) overall coating system density and adhesion to metal substrate; and (d) compatibility between the LBL and sol-gel coatings.

$T_f$ -cured Ormosil thin films are expected to contain a certain amount of inherent porosity, dependent on cure time and the catalyst used. The acid catalysis used in this study may produce linear siloxane chains that yield a higher-density coating than those prepared using base catalysis. However, the presence of open, interconnected porosity in the Ormosil thin film is expected to provide channels for the migration of corrosion initiators through the coating, even though the rate of penetration should be slowed significantly.

In ACI-doped LBL films, the corrosion initiators that penetrate the sol-gel coating are expected to be attracted to the ion-exchange capacity of the montmorillonite clay platelets. The presence of small amounts of water are expected to aid in the migration of these species along

the clay platelets, parallel to the AA surface, thereby providing a more difficult path for the initiators to follow towards the metal as compared to a straight channel or open pore. The initiators potentially may also be absorbed by the clay platelets, limiting their migration.

#### **D. Conclusions**

Single- and multilayer LBL/Ormosil coating systems were investigated. The optimum number of layers for the LBL coating was found to be  $n = 15$ , as this thickness provided adequate substrate coverage and adhesion. Although the resistance of LBL coatings is minimal, they form the passivating layer on the surface aluminum oxide and increase the oxide resistance. Incorporation of ACI's was found to increase the corrosion resistance of the LBL coatings. The application of a dense barrier Ormosil layer was found to seal the ACI's into the LBL coating, providing a reservoir of ACI's. The LBL/Ormosil coating system provides several functions, including: (a) the barrier properties of the Ormosil layer result in a reduction of the concentration of corrosion initiators that come in contact with the ACI reservoir and ultimately the metal substrate; (b) the LBL coating may potentially change the pathway/rate by which the initiators approach/migrate to the AA; and (c) the exchanged LBL coating may release ACI ions in the vicinity of a defect site, thereby mitigating corrosion reactions on the metal surface.

## **II. Release-on-Command Technologies**

### **A. Introduction**

LBL/Ormosil coating systems on AA's provide an interesting challenge for coating removal. This behavior stems from the fact that these coating systems *are not susceptible to degradation* using common techniques employed for the removal of organic coatings from metal substrates, presumably due to the potential to form covalent Si-O-Al bonds with the underlying  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  surface layer and their chemical inertness. The main goal of this portion of the research effort was to determine a coating-removal technique that will remove both Ormosil and LBL

coatings “on demand” without destroying the AA surface. Two coating removal methodologies were investigated: (a) immersion in a basic zincate solution and (b) immersion in a dilute sodium oxalate solution.

#### **B. Ormosil Dissolution in Various Solvents**


Various acidic, basic, and organic solvents were investigated as Ormosil-coating-removal agents from 2024-T3 AA substrates. Table V shows the results of 30-min. immersion experiments. Polar organic solvents, such as alcohols and ketones, were found to affect the Ormosil coatings investigated. The effectiveness of the alcohol was found to be inversely proportional to the

**Table V: Effects of Various Solvents on the Ormosil Coatings Under Investigation**

<b>Solvent</b>	<b>Coating Condition</b>
Methanol	Flaked Off
Ethanol	Not Affected
Isopropanol	Not Affected
Acetone	Flaked Off
Methyl Ethyl Ketone	Flaked Off
Hexanes	Not Affected
5-M HNO <sub>3</sub>	Cracked
5-M HC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Not Affected
5-M H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	Not Affected
5-M H <sub>3</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>	Not Affected
5-M NH <sub>4</sub> OH	Flaked Off
5-M NaOH	Removed

length of the hydrocarbon chain, as methanol was found to affect the Ormosil, while ethanol and isopropanol were not. It is anticipated that the effectiveness of alcohol- and ketone-based solvents resides in the ability of these solvents to solubilize the organic portions of the Ormosil coating, thereby degrading the integrity of the coating. Hexanes solution, a nonpolar organic solvent, was not found to affect the integrity of any of the Ormosil coatings. Acidic solutions, prepared from either strong or weak acids, were not found to remove the Ormosil coating, though HNO<sub>3</sub> was found to cause cracking. Basic solutions were found to degrade the Ormosil coating. For example, 5-M NH<sub>4</sub>OH promoted Ormosil film flaking as the coating dried after the immersion period; 5-M NaOH was found to remove effectively each of the four investigated Ormosil coatings from the AA substrate. While basic solutions were shown to be effective for

removing the Ormosil coating from the AA substrate, these reagents may potentially attack the AA substrate, leading to degradation of the metal.




In order to avoid degradation of the metal substrate, zincate solutions were also investigated as potential coating-removal reagents. Zincate is a highly basic solution containing zinc compounds commonly used in electroless and electroplating applications. In this study, zincate solutions were found to remove the Ormosil coating from the AA effectively, leaving a thin zincate layer on the AA surface. This is illustrated in Figure 10, in which the dark area represents a thin zinc layer on the AA. Very low zincate concentrations,  $c \leq 1 \text{ vol } \%$ , were found to be ineffective for removing the Ormosil coatings from the AA substrate. Increasing the



zincate concentration to  $c \approx 5$  vol % facilitated coating removal. Higher zincate concentrations,  $10 \leq c \leq 25$  vol %, were found to be highly effective for coating removal.

### **C. LBL/Ormosil Coating Removal Using Dilute Zincate Solutions**

Figure 11 shows that coating removal time ( $t_{cr}$ ) was found to depend on the zincate concentration. For the investigated Ormosil film, increasing  $c$  to 15 vol % led to a decrease in  $t_{cr}$ . For the Ormosil coating under investigation, increasing the zincate solution to higher  $c$  produced a slight increase in  $t_{cr}$ . The  $t_{cr}$  value is also expected to be a function of coating composition and structure, as thicker coatings may require a longer immersion time ( $t_i$ ).



**Figure 11: Coating Removal Behavior as a Function of Zincate Concentration for an Ormosil Coating**

In order to produce a clean AA substrate, the residual zinc layer was easily removed using a dilute phosphoric acid solution. For this purpose, very dilute solutions,  $c(\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4) \leq 2$  vol %, were the most effective for zinc removal. Higher  $\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4$  concentrations were found to be ineffective for removing the zinc layer. The results of this study indicate that a combination of coating removal using the zincate solution followed by zinc removal using dilute phosphoric acid

effectively removes the Ormosil coating and restores the AA surface; at this point, the cleaned AA is prepared for additional coating application as needed.

In summary, dilute zincate solutions may be used to remove effectively Ormosil coatings from 2024-T3 AA's at  $T_r$ . The coating removal technique leaves a thin layer of zinc on the AA surface, which prevents further attack of the metal surface by the basic zincate solution. The zinc layer may be removed easily by immersion in dilute  $H_3PO_4$ , which maintains the integrity of the AA surface.

#### **D. LBL Coating Dissolution**

##### **1. Zincate Solution**

LBL film assemblies, taking into consideration their main components, also provide an interesting challenge for coating removal. Experiments show that dissolution of LBL coating assemblies from the AA surface using dilute alkaline zincate solution requires more-concentrated solutions than removal of the Ormosil thin films does, as is shown in Figure 12. (As in Figure 10, the dark area represents a thin zinc layer on the AA.) These results indicate that only a 25-vol-% zincate solution can effectively remove the LBL coating assembly from the AA surface, compared with complete removal of investigated Ormosil thin films starting with 5 vol %.

Optimization of the coating-removal conditions for the LBL/Ormosil coating system indicates that a 25-vol-% zincate solution will remove both coatings in 3 min., as is shown in Figure 13. The dark area represents a thin zincate layer on the AA; coating removal using zincate solution leaves a thin layer of zincate product on the AA surface. Subsequent zincate product removal using dilute  $H_3PO_4$  restores the AA surface.





Figure 13(a) shows bare AA after a 4-min. immersion in 2%  $H_3PO_4$  as a comparison. Figure 13(b) shows the partial removal of a 15-layer LBL/Ormosil coating (top) following a 3-min. immersion in 25-vol-% zincate (bottom). Figure 13(c) shows the partial removal of the same 15-layer LBL/Ormosil coating (top) following a 3-min. immersion in 25-vol-% zincate (middle), followed in turn by a 4-min. immersion in 2-vol-%  $H_3PO_4$  (bottom). As was the case for the Ormosil coating, in order to produce a clean AA substrate, the residual zincate layer was easily removed using a dilute  $H_3PO_4$  solution.




## 2. Coating Removal Using Oxalate Solutions

An alternative coating-removal method for LBL coatings was to use dilute sodium oxalate solutions.  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  was chosen based on its known ability to passivate aluminum surfaces [42] and to form chelate complexes with the aluminosilicate portion of the clay particles that make up an integral part of the LBL composition.

Removal of the LBL coating system and the subsequent loss of corrosion-protective properties it provided were monitored using EIS. Electrochemical analysis indicated a decrease in  $R_{\text{tot}}$  of the investigated coating system during the incubation in  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solution is dependent on  $c$  and pH, as is shown in Table VI.  $R_{\text{tot}}$  was found to decrease during the incubation in the  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solution as a function of time for each of the three concentrations of  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  investigated, as is shown in Figure 14. From this data it is inferred that the more concentrated  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solution ( $c = 10^{-3}$ – $10^{-2}$  M, pH = 6.8) the steeper the slope of the polarization resistance vs. time curve. These results indicate that  $t_{\text{cr}}$  is inversely proportional to  $c(\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4)$ .


**Table VI: EIS Characteristics as a Function of LBL Coating Removal Time in Various Sodium Oxalate Solutions**

$c(\text{C}_2\text{O}_4^{2-}), M$	pH	$t_r, h$	$C_{ox}, \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$	$R_{pob}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{pox}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$	$R_{tot}, \text{k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$
—	—	0 (2024-T3 AA, freshly deoxidized)	—	2	—	2
—	—	0 (bare AA with natural oxide layer)	—	48	—	48
—	—	0 ( $n = 15$ LBL)	1.9	1015	17	1032
$10^{-1}$	6.8	1	3.5	569	23	592
$10^{-1}$	6.8	2	7.8	115	40	155
$10^{-1}$	6.8	3	6.3	119	11	130
$10^{-1}$	6.8	4	5.3	81	3	84
$10^{-1}$	6.8	5	5	79	1	80
$10^{-2}$	6.8	1	2.0	487	11	498
$10^{-2}$	6.8	2	6.2	241	43	244
$10^{-2}$	6.8	3	6.0	127	32	159
$10^{-2}$	6.8	4	4.8	46	9	55
$10^{-2}$	6.8	5	4.9	47	9	56
$10^{-3}$	6.8	1	1.9	615	10	625
$10^{-3}$	6.8	2	1.2	331	37	368
$10^{-3}$	6.8	3	1.2	316	53	369
$10^{-3}$	6.8	4	5.2	136	23	159
$10^{-3}$	6.8	5	5.0	112	18	130
$10^{-2}$	10.3	0 ( $n = 15$ LBL)	1	883	17	900
$10^{-2}$	10.3	1	8	90	17	107
$10^{-2}$	10.3	2	7	59	11	70
$10^{-2}$	10.3	3	44	32	2	34
$10^{-2}$	10.3	4	46	31	2	33
$10^{-2}$	10.3	5	47	32	2	33



**Figure 14: Total Polarization Resistance During the Incubation in Various Sodium Oxalate Solutions as a Function of Solution Concentration and Time**

Increasing the pH of the 0.01-M  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solution from 6.8 to 10.3 of 0.01 M was found to facilitate LBL coating removal from AA specimens, as is plotted in Figure 15 and illustrated in Figure 16. For all investigated  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solutions ( $10^{-3}$ – $10^{-1}$  M, pH = 6.8),  $R_{\text{tot}}$  of immersed LBL-coated AA specimens (15 layers) was not reduced to  $\leq 48 \text{ k}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ , the total polarization resistance of AA with natural oxide film on its surface. This is indicative of the benign effect  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  has on the  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  surface during the incubation period and indicates that residual  $\text{C}_2\text{O}_4^{2-}$  ions on the AA surface provide an inhibitive effect after the LBL coating systems have been removed.  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solutions were found to remove the LBL coating system and to provide corrosion protection for the underlying metal.




**Figure 15: Total Polarization Resistance During the Incubation in 0.01-M Sodium Oxalate Solution as a Function of pH and Time**

#### **E. Summary**

In summary, two methods were investigated by which to remove the LBL/Ormosil coating systems from the AA substrate “on demand.” Zincate solutions were found to be effective for the rapid removal of the LBL/Ormosil coating systems from the metal substrate

*Investigation of Integrated Coating System for Corrosion Protection*

leaving a thin zincate product layer.  $\text{Na}_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4$  solutions were found to remove the LBL coating system and to provide corrosion protection of the underlying metal.





### III. References

1. Nylund, A. *Aluminum Transactions* **2000**, 2, 121.
2. (a) Smith, C. J. E.; Baldwin, K. R.; Garrett, S. A.; Gibson, M. C.; Hewins, M. A. H.; Lane, P. L. *ATB Metallurgie* **1997**, 37, 266. (b) Puipe, J. *Galvanotechnik*. **1990**, 90, 3003. (c) Hinton, B. R. *Metal Finishing* **1991**, 89, 15.
3. Twite, R. L.; Bierwagen, G. P. *Progress in Organic Coatings* **1998**, 33, 91 (1998).
4. Roland, W.; Kresse, J. *ATB Metallurgie* **1997**, 37, 89.
5. (a) Hinton, B. R. W. *J. Alloys Compd.* **1992** 180, 15. (b) Arnott, D. R.; Ryan, N. E.; Hinton, B. R. W.; Sexton, B. A.; Hughes, A. E. *Appl. Surf. Sci.* **1985**, 22, 236. (c) Morris, E.; Stoffer, J. O.; O'Keefe, T. J.; Yu, P.; Lin, X. *Polymeric Materials* **1999**, 81, 167. (d) Ramanathan, L. V. *Corrosion Prevention & Control* **1998**, 4, 87.
6. Schriever, M. P., U.S. Patent **5,551,994**, 3 September 1996.
7. (a) Danilidis, I.; Sykes, J. M.; Hunter, J. A.; Scamans, G. M. *Surf. Engr.* **1999**, 15, 401. (b) Srinivasan, P. B.; Sathiyarayanan, S.; Marikkannu, C.; Balakrishnan, K. *Corrosion Prevention & Control* **1995** (April), 35.
8. Rangel, C. M.; Simões, A.; Newman, R. C. *Portugaliae Electrochimica Acta* **1997**, 15, 383.
9. (a) Schram, T.; Goeminne, G.; Terryn, H.; Vanhoolst, W.; Van Espen, P. *Trans. I.M.F.* **1995**, 73, 91. (b) Pearlstein, F.; Agarwala, V. S. *Plating and Surface Finishing* **1994**, 81, 50.
10. van Ooij, W. J.; Zhang, C.; Zhang, J. W.; Yuan, W. *Electrochem. Soc. Proc.* **1998**, 97-41, 222.

11. (a) van Ooij, W. J.; Song, J.; Subramanian, V. *ATB Metallurgie* **1997**, 37, 137. (b) Child, T. F.; van Ooij, W. J., *Trans. IMF* **1999**, 77, 64. (c) Subramanian, V.; van Ooij, W. J. *Surf. Engr.* **1999**, 15, 168. (d) van Ooij, W. J.; Child, T. *ChemTech* **1998**, 28, 26.
12. Delaunois, F.; Poulain, V.; Petitjean, J. P. *ATB Metallurgie* **1997**, 37.
13. (a) Schmidt, H. K. *Mater. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.* **1990**, 180, 961. (b) Mackenzie, J. D. *J. Sol-Gel Sci. Technol.* **1994**, 1, 81.
14. Kasemann, R.; Schmidt, H. *New J. Chem.* **1994**, 18, 1117.
15. (a) Kato, K. *J. Mater. Sci.* **1992**, 28, 1445. (b) Kato, K. *J. Mater. Sci.* **1993**, 28, 4033. (c) Donley, M. S.; Vreugdenhil, A. J. *J. Coat. Technol.* **2001**, 73, 915. (d) Metroke, T. L.; Parkhill, R. L.; Knobbe, E. T. *Mater. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.* **1999**, 576, 293. (e) Metroke, T. L.; Knobbe, E. T. *Mater. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.* **2000**, 628, CC11.4.1. (f) Parkhill, R. L.; Knobbe, E. T.; Donley, M. S. *Prog. Org. Coat.* **2001**, 41, 261. (g) Osborne, J. H.; Blohowiak, K. Y.; Taylor, S. R.; Hunter, C.; Bierwagen, G.; Carlson, B.; Bernard, D.; Donley, M. S. *Prog. Org. Coat.* **2001**, 41, 217. (g) Voevodin, N. N.; Grebasch, N. T.; Soto, W. S.; Kasten, L. S.; Grant, J. T.; Arnold, F. E.; Donley, M. S., *Prog. Org. Coat.* **2001**, 41, 287. (h) Voevodin, N. N.; Grebasch, N. T.; Soto, W. S.; Arnold, F. E.; Donley, M. S., *Surf. Coat. Technol.* **2001**, 140, 24. (i) Khobaib, M.; Reynolds, L. B.; Donley, M. S. *Surf. Coat. Technol.* **2001**, 140, 16. (j) Yang, X. F.; Tallman, D. E.; Gelling, V. J.; Bierwagen, G. P.; Kasten, L. S.; Berg, J. *Surf. Coat. Technol.* **2001**, 140, 44. (k) Kachurina, O.; Metroke, T. L.; Stesikova, E.; Knobbe, E. T. *J. Coat. Technol.* **2002**, 74, 43. (l) Metroke, T. L.; Kachurina, O.; Knobbe, E. T., *J. Coat. Technol.* **2002**, 74, 53.

16. Guglielmi, M. *J. Sol-Gel Sci. Technol.* **1997**, *8*, 443.
17. Metroke, T. L.; Parkhill, R. L.; Knobbe, E. T. *Prog. Org. Coatings* **2001**, *41*, 233.
18. (a) Klitzing, R.; Möhwald, H. *Thin Solid Films* **1996**, *284-285*, 352. (b) Saremi, F.; Maassen, E.; Tieke, B. *Langmuir* **1995**, *11*, 1068. (c) Klitzing, R.; Möhwald, H. *Macromolecules* **1996**, *29*, 6901.
19. (a) Lvov, Y.; Haas, H.; Decher, G.; Mohwald, H.; Mikhailov, A.; Mtchedlishvily, B.; Morgunova, E.; Vainstein, B. *Langmuir* **1994**, *10*, 4232. (b) Lvov, Y.; Ariga, K.; Kunitake, T. *Chem. Lett.* **1994**, 2323. (c) Onda, M.; Lvov, Y.; Ariga, K.; Kunitake, T. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **1996**, *51*. (d) Lvov, Y.; Ariga, K.; Ichinose, I.; Kunitake, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, *117*, 6117. (e) Hodak, J.; Etchenique, R.; Calvo, E.; Singhal, K.; Bartlett, P. M. *Langmuir* **1997**, *13*, 2708.
20. (a) Cheng, J. H.; Fou, A. F.; Rubner, M. F. *Thin Solid Films* **1994**, *244*, 985. (b) Ferreira, M.; Cheung, J. H.; Rubner, M. F. *Thin Solid Films* **1994**, *244*, 806.
21. Keller, S. W.; Kim, H. N.; Mallouk, T. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 8817.
22. (a) Zhang, X.; Gao, M.; Kong, X.; Sun, Y.; Shen, J. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1994**, 1055. (b) Cooper, T. M.; Campbell, A. L.; Crane, R. L. *Langmuir* **1995**, *11*, 2713. (c) Ichinoze, I.; Fujiyoshi, K.; Mizuki, S.; Lvov, Y.; Kunitake, T. *Chem. Lett.* **1996**, 257.
23. (a) Keller, S. W.; Kim, H. N.; Mallouk, T. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 8817. (b) Feldheim, D. L.; Crabar, K. C.; Natan, M. J.; Mallouk, T. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, *118*, 7640. (c) Schmitt, J.; Decher, G.; Dressik, W. J.; Branduo, S. L.; Geer, R. E.; Shashidhal, R.; Calvert, J. *Adv. Mater.* **1997**, *9*, 61. (d) Freeman, R. G.; Grabar, K. C.; Allison, K. J.; Bright, R. M.; Davis, J. A.; Guthrie, A. P.; Hommer, M. B.; Jackson, M.

- A.; Smith, P. C.; Walter, D. G.; Natan, M. J. *Science* **1995**, *267*, 1629. (e) Grabar, K. C.; Freeman, R. G.; Hommer, M. B.; Natan, M. J., *Anal. Chem.* **1995**, *67*, 735.
24. Kotov, N. A.; Dékány, I.; Fendler, J. H. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1995**, *99*, 13065.
25. (a) Kleinfeld, E. R.; Ferguson, G. S. *Chem. Mater.* **1995**, *7*, 2327. (b) Kleinfeld, E. R.; Ferguson, G. S. *Chem. Mater.* **1996**, *8*, 1575. (c) Kleinfeld, E. R.; Ferguson, G. S., *Science*, **1994**, *265*, 370. (d) Kleinfeld, E. R.; Ferguson, G. S. *Mater. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.* **1995**, *369*, 697. (e) Lvov, Y.; Ariga, K.; Ichinose, I.; Kunitake, T. *Langmuir*, **1996**, *12*, 3038. (f) Kotov, N. A.; Dékány, I.; Fendler, J. H. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1995**, *99*, 13065. (g) Kotov, N. A.; Haraszti, T.; Turi, L.; Zavala, G.; Geer, R. E.; Dékány, I.; Fendler, J. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 6821.
26. Kotov, N. A.; Dékány, I.; Fendler, J. H. *Adv. Mater.*, **1996**, *8*, 637.
27. Kleinfeld, E. R.; Ferguson, G. S. *Science* **1994**, *265*, 370.
28. Kotov, N. A.; Haraszti, T.; Zavala, G.; Geer, R. E.; Dékány, I.; Fendler, J. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 6821.
29. Schriever, M. P. U.S. Patent **5,873,953**, 2 February 1999.
30. Jones, D. A., Ed. *Principles and Prevention of Corrosion* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1992).
31. Twite, R.; Balbyshev, S.; Bierwagen, G. *Spec. Pub. Electrochem. Soc.* **1997** 95–16 (*Proceedings of the Symposium on Environmentally Acceptable Inhibitors and Coatings*), 202.
32. Ilevbare, G. O.; Scully, J. R.; Yuan, J.; Kelly, R. G. *Corrosion* **2000**, *56*.
33. Bacon, R. C.; Smith, J. J.; Rugg, F. M. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* **1948**, *40*, 161.

34. Zhang, S.; Czekaj, C. L.; Ford, W. T. *J. Magn. Reson.* **1994**, *A111*, 87.
35. Correa-Duarte, M. A.; Giersig, M.; Kotov, N. A.; Liz-Marzan, L. M. *Langmuir* **1998**, *14*, 6430.
36. Kotov, N. A.; Haraszti, T.; Turi, L.; Zavala, G.; Geer, R. E.; Dékány, I.; Fendler, J. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 6821.
37. Delattre, L.; Dupuy, C.; Babonneau, F. *J. Sol-Gel Sci. Technol.* **1994**, *2*, 185.
38. (a) Ilevbare, G. O.; Scully, J. R.; Yuan, Y.; Kelly, R. G. *Corrosion* **2000**, *56*, 227. (b) Hughes, A. E.; Taylor, R. J.; Hinton, B. R. W. *Surf. Interface Anal.* **1997**, *25*, 223. (c) Lytle, F. W.; Greigor, R. B.; Bibbins, G. L.; Blohowiak, K. Y.; Smith, R. E.; Tuss, G. D. *Corr. Sci.* **1995**, *37*, 349. (d) Jeffcoate, S.; Isaacs, H. S.; Aldykiewicz, A. J.; Ryan, M. P. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2000**, *147*, 540. (e) Xia, L.; McCreery, R. L. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1998**, *15*, 3083.
39. Levela, L.; Chin, J.; del Amo, B. *Prog. Org. Coat.* **1999**, *36*, 211.
40. Dai, J.; Sullivan, D. M.; Bruening, M. L. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2000**, *39*, 3528.
41. Kotov, N. A.; Magonov, S.; Tropsha, E. *Chem. Mater.* **1997**, *9* (3), 1345.
42. Kobotiatis, L.; Pebere, N.; Koustsousoukos, P. *Corr. Sci.* **1999**, *41*, 941.